

## **REMARKS**

Entry of this Response to the instant Office Action and reconsideration are respectfully requested in view of the amendments made to the claims and for the remarks made herein.

Claims 1-20 are pending and stand rejected.

Claims 1-3, 6-7, 13-15 and 18-19 have been amended.

Claims 4 and 16 have been amended.

Claims 1, 3-6, 8-10, 13 and 15-17 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) are being anticipated by Roy (USP no. 5,966,135).

In maintaining the rejection of the claims, the Office states that "Roy teaches the zooming of an image around a selected point, the point then being displayed in the center of the enlarged image. Furthermore, Roy teaches the display upon which the initial image is based and used as a first coordinate point, taught as the returning as the co-ordinate values in the above cited map object reports." (see OA, page 8, lines 1-4).

Applicant respectfully disagrees with end explicitly traverses the reason for rejection the claims. However, to provide a clearer recitation of the subject matter claimed as the invention the independent claims have been amended to recite that an enlargement of an image is made based on the selection of a desired point and the enlargement is presented about a point determined as a center point associated with an area surrounding the desired point and that the desired point and the determined point are presented on the enlarged image. No new matter has been added. Support for the amendment may be found at least in Figures 1-3, which represents a desired point 13 upon which enlargement selection is made and point 21, which represents a point determined as a center of area 20 and in cancelled claim 4. Although, cancelled claim 4 has been rejected based on the same reference as cited in rejecting the independent claims, it will be shown that Roy fails to disclose the subject matter recited in the independent claims as amended.

Roy, as previously characterized, teaches a system that enables viewing a map picture that is generated from vector-base data. Additionally map pictures are comprised of map objects, such as states and cities. Map objects can be chosen to obtain additional information, for example, a different map picture. Additionally, areas of the map picture can be zoomed in to view the areas with greater resolution or to obtain additional data about the areas. (see Abstract). Roy teaches that map objects may be selected and that "when any map objects that were previously chosen will no longer be chosen." See col. 12, lines 53-54. Roy further teaches multiple map objects may be chosen. See col. 12, lines 54-55 ("[a] map object can be added to the group of previously chosen map objects by holding the <SHIFT> key while choosing the map object." Roy additionally teaches expanding an image by zooming ("[s]everal types of zoom command are available. A user can choose to zoom in by a factor of two by choosing the zoom command from the menu bar, by using the mouse cursor to choose a point around which to zoom." (see col. 13, lines 25-30).

In rejecting the claims, the Office Action refers to "Roy [as teaching] the zooming of an image around a selected point, the point then being displayed in the center of the enlarged image. Furthermore, Roy teaches the display as a point upon which the initial image is based and used as a first co-ordinate point, taught as the returning of co-ordinate values in the above cited map object report" (see page 8, lines 1-4).

However, contrary to the statements made in the Office Action, Roy fails to teach displaying an enlarged image based on a desired point, the desired point and a point determined as a center of an area around the desired point upon which the enlarged image is based. Rather as the Office Action states Roy teaches that a point on a map is a selected point and the selected point is the center of the image. Thus, Roy fails to consider that the selected point may be different than the point upon which the image is displayed as Roy, as characterized by the Office Action, considers these two points the same points. (see col. 13, lines 25-32 "[s]everal types of zoom commands are available. A user can choose to zoom in by a factor of two by choosing the zoom command from the menu bar, by using the mouse cursor to choose a point around which to zoom and then clicking the mouse button. A user can zoom in to a rectangular area by choosing the zoom command from the menu bar and by using the mouse cursor to select a rectangular

area on the map picture. A user can also zoom to a particular width by choosing the zoom width command ...")

Thus, Roy clearly teaches that if a point is chosen then this is the center of the image and if an area is chosen the enlargement is based on the selected area.

Accordingly, Roy cannot be said to anticipate the present invention, because Roy fails to disclose each and every element recited.

At least for this reason, applicant submits that the rejection of the claim can no longer be sustained and respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claim.

With regard to the remaining independent claims, applicant submits that the reason for rejecting these claims has been overcome in view of the amendments made to the claims and for the remarks made with regard to the rejection of claim 1.

For at least this reason, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claims.

With regard the remaining claims, these claims ultimately depend from the independent claims, which have been shown to contain subject matter not disclosed by, and, hence, allowable over, the reference cited. Accordingly, these claims are also allowable by virtue of their dependency from an allowable base claim.

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claims.

Claims 2 and 14 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roy and Smith (UK application GB 2,344,037).

Applicant respectfully disagrees with and explicitly traverses the reason for rejecting the claims.

Claims 2 and 14 depend from independent claims 1 and 13, which have been shown not to be anticipated by Roy as Roy fails to recite a material element claimed. Smith is recited for teaching the element of returning a point previously selected by the user as displayed on an enlargement. However, Smith fails to provide any teaching to correct the deficiency found to exist in Roy.

Accordingly, the invention recited in claims 2 and 14 is not rendered obvious by the teachings of Roy and Smith, as the thus the device created by the combination of the

cited references fails to recite all the elements claimed in the independent claims and, consequently, in the dependent claims.

Having shown that the combined device fails to disclose all the elements claimed, applicant submits the reason for the rejection can no longer be sustained. Thus, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claim.

For all the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all the present claims are patentable in view of the cited references. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

This paper is being filed with a Petition for an Extension of Time, with appropriate fee, to allow one (1) additional month (until October 19, 2007) to file this paper from the date of the above referred to Office Action. No additional fees are believed necessary for the filing of this paper.

Respectfully submitted,  
Paul Im  
Registration No. 50,418

Date: October 19, 2007

/Paul Im/  
By: Carl A. Giordano, Esq. (Reg. No. 41,780)  
Attorney for Applicants  
Law Office of Carl Giordano  
210 Route 4 East, Suite 103  
Paramus, New Jersey 07652  
(201) 421 0865

**Mail all correspondence to:**  
Paul Im, Registration No. 50,418  
PHILIPS Intellectual Property & Standards  
P.O. Box 3001  
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001  
Phone: (914) 333-9624  
Fax: (914) 332-0615